

### **REMARKS**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the through consideration given the present application. Claims 1-6 are currently being prosecuted. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejections in view of the amendments and remarks as set forth below.

#### *Entry of Amendment*

Applicants request that the present Amendment be entered and given full consideration. The Amendment includes only changes to claim 1 to better define the invention. Applicants submit that these changes do not raise any new issues since the structure has not been changed but merely defined in more detail. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment and full consideration thereof is respectfully requested.

#### *Rejection Under 35 USC 103*

Claims 1, 3-5 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious over Fan (US Patent 6,807,342) in view of Tehrani (US Patent 5,430,574), Pan (US Patent 5,359,683) and Pedrotti et al. ("Introduction to Optics", 1993). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

First, Applicants submit that claim 1 as well as the claims that depend there from are not obvious over this combination of references. The Examiner has put together pieces of four different references to try to meet the terms of the claim. Applicants submit that there is no motivation for combining such a wide variety of parts without hindsight. Applicants submit that if the Examiner continues with this rejection that he provide some indication as to why one skilled in the art would be motivated to look to the other three references to improve the fan device. Applicants submit that the Examiner has not taught sufficient motivation for making such a combination and accordingly, these claims are allowable.

Further, Applicants have now amended claim 1 to better define the invention. In regard to the multi-layered film, Applicants have now made it clear that this is a single multi-layered film and that it is isolated from the first and second collimators. It is noted that in the main reference, Fan shows two such films 18 and 19 between the two fibers 22 and 24. The use of a single film is advantageous since it simplifies the alignment process. The loading design of assembly using

two such multiple layers is also more difficult. Further, none of the secondary references teach the concept of using a single multi-layered film. Applicants submit that claim 1, as amended, further defines over the Fan reference, whether alone or taken in conjunction with the secondary references. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 1-6 are allowable.

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious over Fan in view of Tehrani, Pan and Pedrotti et al. and further in view of Domash (US Publication 2003/0072009). Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious over Fan in view of Tehrani, Pan and Pedrotti et al. and further in view of Huang (US Patnet 6,263,128). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Examiner has cited Domash to show a heat actuated type filter. The Examiner has cited Huang to show the use of anti-reflective coatings. Applicants submit that even if these references do show these features, these claims remain allowable based on their dependency from allowable claim 1.

### *Conclusion*

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that claims clearly distinguish over the patents relied on by the Examiner, either alone or in combination. In view of this, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all the claims are respectfully requested.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Robert F. Gnuse Reg. No. 27,295 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Application No. 10/673,388  
Amendment dated May 30, 2007  
After Final Office Action of December 1, 2006

Docket No.: 0941-1749PUS1

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: May 31, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Joe McKinney Muncy

Registration No.: 32,334

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant